

<b><i>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</i></b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/511,245	<b>Applicant(s)</b> FOSTER ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Magali P. Slawski	<b>Art Unit</b> 1795	

  

**All Participants:**

(1) Magali P. Slawski.

(2) Mr. Matthew J. Hierholzer.

**Date of Interview:** \_\_\_\_\_

**Type of Interview:**

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant    ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes    ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:  
*none*

Claims discussed:  
*1, 43, 44*

Prior art documents discussed:  
*none*

**Part II.**

**SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:**

*The examiner asked Applicant's representative to authorize moving the limitation that "the solution is maintained below saturation" in order to show at what point in the process that step takes place. We agreed to place that limitation after the equilibrating step because the solution exists only after that step. We also agreed that it was not necessary to include the phrase "in the pressure chamber" because the solution is made in the pressure chamber.*

**Part III.**

☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_\_

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

**Time:** \_\_\_\_\_

/Jennifer K. Michener/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1795

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)